Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/090,024	DE WET, PIERRE JACOBUS
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Steven L. Weinstein	1761
All Participants:	Status of Application:	
(1) <u>Steven L. Weinstein</u> .	(3)	
(2) Mr. P. Jacobus de Wet.	(4)	
Date of Interview: 3 December 2004	Time:	
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicat Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description:	ant's representative)	
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed:		
Claims discussed:		
Prior art documents discussed: reference applied		
Part II.		
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENER See Continuation Sheet	RAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS	DISCUSSED:
Part III.		
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate redirectly resulted in the allowance of the application. The of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate redid not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary 	ecord of the substance of the in	n summary of the substance
		,
Steven Weinstein	· ·	
	Applicant's Representative Sigr	nature – if appropriate)
		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner called applicant to clarify his intentions. Applicant filed a paper on 10/27/04 that was unclear as to whether it was a request for reconsideration which required a \$215, 2 month extension of time or a Request For Continued Examination(RCE) which requires the 2 month extension fee plus a \$395 RCE fee. A 2 month extension fee was filed on 11/17/04. Applicant confirmed the paper of 10/27/04 was a request for reconsideration. The examiner told applicant he could not find any allowable subject matter to suggest to applicant and applicant indicated he did not intend to file any additional response and abandon the application.

Stevelloinstein STEVE WEINSTEIN PHIMARY EXAMINED 176/